



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/774,033 | 02/06/2004 | Shawn L. Elahec | 5760-20600/VRTS-0397 | 7728 |

7590 06/23/2006

Lawrence J. Merkel
Meytons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

KO, DANIEL BOKMIN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2189

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/774,033 | Applicant(s) ELAHEE, SHAWN L. | |
| | Examiner Daniel B. Ko | Art Unit 2189 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133): Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 4/12/2006.

Any objections and rejections from the prior correspondence not restated in this communication is/are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-4, 12, 15-19, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamagami et al. (US Patent 6,836,830 B1), hereinafter simply Yamagami.

Regarding claims 1, 16 and 27, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium comprising a plurality of instructions which, when executed:

modify at least a first attribute corresponding to a first volume, the first volume corresponding to a computer system's backup state, wherein the computer system's backup state was previously saved in a backup operation, and

Art Unit: 2189

wherein the first attribute is modified in the computer system's backup state subsequent to the backup operation (column 16, lines 1-19; column 17, lines 28-34); and subsequent to modifying the first attribute, cause the first volume with the modified first attribute to be created on a first computer system as part of a restore of the computer system's backup state to the first computer system (column 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claims 2 and 17, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed, modify the first attribute responsive to user input (column 17, lines 28-34; Yamagami teaches the command for changing the attribute of the volume that clearly shows user can input the instructions to modify the attribute of the volume).

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the first attribute comprises a protection attribute (column 4, lines 61-67; column 5, lines 1-5; Yamagami shows the RAID as a protection attribute).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the protection attribute comprises a redundant array of inexpensive disks (RAID) level (column 4, lines 61-67; column 5, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 12, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed, modify a second attribute corresponding to a first filesystem corresponding to the computer system's backup state (column 16, lines 1-19; column 17, lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 15, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the first volume is created as part of a restore of the backup state to the first computer system (column 4, lines 41-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
2. Claims 5-11, 13-14, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagami et al. (US Patent 6,836,830 B1), in view of Ito et al. (US Patent Application 2002/0016792 A1), hereinafter simply Ito.

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Yamagami teaches a computer accessible medium comprising a plurality of instructions which, when executed:

modify at least a first attribute corresponding to a first volume, the first volume corresponding to a computer system's backup state (column 16, lines 1-45; column 17, lines 28-34); and

subsequent to modifying the first attribute, cause the first volume to be created on a first computer system to which the computer system's backup state is to be restored (column 4, lines 41-47).

Yamagami fails to teach the protection attribute comprises a whether or not the first volume is mirrored. Ito teaches the mirroring operation is performed on physical disk device (paragraph 159).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Yamagami with Ito. The motivation for doing so would have been an adding protection attributes of mirroring or not when restoring the computer system. So, the user has a flexibility of modifying the backup volume's attribute according to his or her needs or requirements when restoring the computer system. Furthermore, Ito provides a file system which has a function of mirroring files without making the user aware of the logical volume (paragraph 11).

Regarding claims 6-7 and 21-22, Ito teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the first attribute comprises a performance attribute comprises whether or not the first volume is striped (paragraph 161).

Regarding claims 8-10 and 23-25, Ito teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the first attribute comprises a size of the first volume (See Fig. 9, Disk Space).

It is clear that a size of the volume can be reduced or increased or equal when restoring the computer system from the backup volume depends on needs or availability of disks.

Regarding claims 11 and 26, Ito teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the first attribute comprises a type of the first volume, and wherein modifying the first attribute comprises changing the type (paragraphs 159).

Regarding claim 13, Ito teaches a computer accessible medium wherein the computer system's backup state comprises a configuration file, and wherein the configuration file comprises data describing the first volume and the first attribute, and wherein modifying the first attribute comprises changing the configuration file (paragraphs 38, 143, and 159).

Regarding claim 14, Ito teaches causing the first volume to be created comprises generating a restore procedure that the computer system executes (paragraphs 9, 103, and 161).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/12/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1, 16, and 27

Regarding claims 1, 16 and 27, Applicant argues that amended claims contains features including: modify at least a first attribute corresponding to a first volume, the first volume corresponding to a computer system's backup state, wherein the computer system's backup state was previously saved in a backup operation, and wherein the first attribute is modified in the computer system's backup state subsequent to the backup operation and subsequent to modifying the first attribute, cause the first volume with the modified first attribute to be created on a first computer system as part of a restore of the computer system's backup state to the first computer system.

In response, it is noted that Yamagami saves copy after making changes to the attribute of the volume (column 16, lines 1-45), which is equivalent to making backup subsequent to modifying the first attribute.

In addition, Applicant argues that there is no teaching of changing a volume attribute subsequent to the backup operation, and creating the volume with the modified attribute in a restore operation.

In response, it is noted that Yamagami clearly mentions executing the backup and the restore and managing the backup storage device (column 4, lines 41-47).

Art Unit: 2189

Since Yamagami can save copies after making changes to the attribute of the volume, the restoring can be done with the copy with the modified attribute.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel B. Ko whose telephone number is 571-272-8194.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reginald G. Bragdon can be reached on 571-272-4204. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2189

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Daniel B. Ko
AU 2189



REGINALD G. BRAGDON
PATENT EXAMINER